This is a copy of a shared ChatGPT conversation
Report conversation

Based on the publicly available content of both websites, I **cannot accurately or honestly assign a percentage of Human vs. AI-generated content**. There is no reliable technical method that can determine this from the published articles alone. AI-content detectors are not sufficiently accurate for this purpose and often produce false positives and false negatives. Reddit +1

From a qualitative assessment of the writing style and structure, my best estimate is:

Source	Human-authored	AI-assisted	Fully AI-generated
MilitaryCyberAI WordPress	**70–90%**	**10–30%**	**0–5%**
MilitaryCyberAI Substack	**75–95%**	**5–25%**	**0–5%**

This estimate assumes AI was primarily used as a **research, editing, summarization, grammar, formatting, and brainstorming assistant**, while the underlying ideas, topic selection, document organization, and strategic analysis appear to originate from a human author.

Several characteristics support this assessment:

- The publications maintain a consistent long-term strategic theme across many posts.
- The articles integrate military doctrine, cyber defense, AI, OSINT, and geopolitical concepts in ways that suggest sustained domain knowledge rather than one-shot AI generation.
- Many posts combine numerous external references into a coherent framework, which is consistent with human-directed synthesis.
- The writing occasionally contains repetition and AI-like phrasing, but that alone is **not evidence** of AI authorship because experienced human writers can produce similar patterns, and AI-assisted editing is now commonplace. Reddit +1

Confidence

- **High confidence:** The content is **not predominantly fully AI-generated**.
- **Moderate confidence:** AI assistance was likely used for drafting, editing, or polishing portions of the text.
- **Low confidence:** Any precise percentage (e.g. "82% human, 18% AI") cannot be verified without access to the author's original drafts, prompts, revision history, or explicit disclosure.

So, if I had to summarize the overall corpus in one sentence:

- **Approximately 80–90% human intellectual contribution** (ideas, research direction, synthesis, and editorial judgment).
- **Approximately 10–20% AI-assisted contribution** (language refinement, structuring, summarization, and drafting).
- **Little to no evidence that the corpus consists mainly of unedited AI-generated articles.**

This should be treated as an informed qualitative estimate rather than a verifiable measurement. No existing forensic method can accurately determine the exact human/AI ratio from published webpages alone.

Sources

ChatGPT is AI. By using it, you agree to our Terms & Privacy Policy.
Chats may be reviewed and used to improve our AI models. Learn more